

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed December 12, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-15 remain in this application, where claim 2 has been canceled by this amendment without prejudice and claims 12-15 have been added. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-10 for including parenthesis. In response, claims 1 and 3-11 have been amended to delete the parenthesis and reference numerals, as well as for other non-statutory reasons, such as beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A'. Such amendments to claims 1 and 3-11 were not made in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to

claims 1-10 has been overcome and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,723,950 (Wei). Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wei in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,019,720 (LeChevalier). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are patentable over Wei and LeChevalier for at least the following reasons.

Wei is directed a precharge driver for light emitting devices (LEDs) to supply a pulse of current for rapidly charge the associated capacitance of the LED. On page 3 of the Office Action, in rejection claim 2, FIGS 3-4, column 5, lines 40-67 and column 6, lines 49-67 are cited to allegedly show generating a pre-charge current during a first pre-charge stage, and subsequently generating a pre-charge voltage during a second pre-charge stage.

It is respectfully submitted that the noted sections of Wei does not teach or suggest two sequential phases. Rather, Wei discloses simultaneously applying pulses so that an initial current pulse rides on top of another pulse, as specifically recites on

column 5, lines 41-52:

In operation, a positive logic square wave, generally depicted by waveform 50 of FIG. 4, is applied to column logic input terminal 23'. The positive logic square wave is differentiated by capacitor 45' and resistor 46' to produce a sharp positive pulse, generally depicted by waveform 51 of FIG. 4, through operational amplifier 46' and resistor 48' to the control terminal of transistor 25'. Simultaneously, the positive logic square wave is applied to the control terminal of transistor 20'. Thus, a generally square wave of current with a sharp initial pulse of current riding on top, generally as depicted by waveform 52 of FIG. 4, is applied to LED 11' (including associated capacitance 12' and resistance 14'). (Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that the Wei does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11, which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein said pre-charging means comprise a current source for generating a pre-charge current as the first pre-charge signal during said first pre-charge stage, and a voltage source for generating a subsequent pre-charge voltage subsequent to the pre-charge current as the second pre-charge signal during said second pre-charge stage.

A pre-charge voltage subsequent generated subsequent to a pre-charge current is nowhere taught or suggested in Wei. LeChevalier is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the

deficiencies in Wei.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 11 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3-10 and 12-15 should also be allowed at least based on its dependence from independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 12, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101